

## Request for Task Proposal/Task Order

## 1. Contractor(s)

a. Contract No.

b. Task Order No. **DE-AT26-06NT42921**

c. Revision No.

This Request for Task Proposal for FutureGen EIS Project is issued pursuant to the Task Orders and Procedures for Issuing Task Orders Clauses of the contract. Technical Direction for this Task shall be in accordance with the Technical Direction Clause of the Contract. **An addendum to this Request for Task Proposal is attached and includes special Task terms and conditions, Statement of Work (Attachment A), and Instructions to Offerors (including the evaluation criteria).**

**This is a multi-phase Task Order. The Task Order shall be incrementally funded. Phase I will be initiated with the award of the Task Order, Phases II and III are contingent upon satisfactory performance during the preceding phase. Within 10 days after DOE's notification of final site selection, the contractor will be required to submit a final cost estimate for the entire project. Upon completion of negotiations and final acceptance of the cost estimate the Target Cost and Incentive Fee will be established in a Task Order Modification (see addendum for additional details).**

Issued by:

Date:

## 2. Items Being Acquired

☐ EA☒ EIS☐ Special Environmental Analysis/Section☐ Environmental Report

## 3. Task to be Performed

Title: **Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the FutureGen Project**☒ Attached

Description of Work and Objective (Statement of Work (SOW) – must be within contract Statement of Work)

## 4. Project/Program Description Information Available

(Examples of available task information)

Background/Location of Work

Project or Program Description

Purpose and Need (if identified)

Preliminary Alternatives (if identified, or expectations)

☐ Attached – Notice of Intent

Expected Complexity of Task

Extent of Available Documents and Other Information

Materials Involved, Hazards, Special Safety Considerations

Security Considerations, Site Access Requirements

Special Services or Staffing which may be Required

## 5. Expected Date of Commencement of Work and Schedule for Performance

☒ Attached☐ None

## 6. Scoping Meetings, Public Meetings, Public Involvement Expected

☒ Attached☐ None

## 7. Expected Purpose, Duration and Location of Travel

☐ Attached☒ None

## 8. Government Furnished Facilities, Materials, Property and/or Equipment

☐ Attached☒ None

## 9. Deliverables and Reports Required and Delivery Schedule

☒ Attached☐ None

## 10. NEPA Process/Document Checklists Applicable

☐ Attached☒ None

## 11. Any Other Pertinent Task Information

☒ Attached☐ None

## 12. The following action is required by the contractor:

☒ Task Proposal Requested - the contractor shall submit a Task Proposal to the Ordering Contracting Officer within 12 working days (5/22/2006). Further instructions from the Ordering Contracting Officer will follow after review of the Task Proposal.

☐ Task Order - the contractor shall provide a Task plan within 10 (or other \_\_\_\_\_) calendar days. Further instructions from the Ordering Contracting Officer will be issued before proceeding with the Task Order described herein.

## 13. Selection Factors for Competitive Task Proposals (If Applicable)

☐ Cost Price Only (does not require selection factors)☐ Past Performance Only (does not require selection factors)☐ Cost Price and Other Factors☐ Past Performance and Other Factors☒ Other Criteria

Selection Factors and Relative Importance

See Addendum attached (Evaluation Criteria)

## 14. Pricing

☐ Fixed Price☒ Cost Reimbursable☒ Incentive Fee Applicable: ☒ Yes☐ No☐ Task Order specific ceiling rates/hour attached

## Request for Task Proposal/Task Order

**15. Ordering Contracting Officer and Contracting Officer's Representative**

The Ordering Contracting Officer for this Task Order is: The Ordering Contracting Officer Representative for this Task Order is:  
 Department of Energy, NETL Department of Energy, NETL  
**3610 Collins Ferry Road, P.O. Box 880 M/S 107** **3610 Collins Ferry Road, P.O. Box 880 M/S**  
 Morgantown, WV 26507-0880 Morgantown, WV 26507-0880  
 ATTN: Donald Hafer, Contract Specialist ATTN: Rob Martinez, COR  
 Telephone Number: 304-285-1361 Telephone Number: 304-285-4121

Document Manager

If not the Ordering Contracting Officer's Representative, the Document Manager for this Task Order is:

Department of Energy  
**3610 Collins Ferry Road, P.O. Box 880 M/S**  
 Morgantown, WV 26507-0880  
 ATTN: Mark McKoy, NEPA Document Manager  
 Telephone Number: 304-285-4426

**16. Small Business Subcontracting Plan**

Type of Business	Percentage Goal	Dollar Goal
Small Business	10 %	\$
Small Disadvantaged Business	3 %	\$
Woman Owned Business	3 %	\$

**17. Billing Instructions**

For this Task Order, billing will be in accordance with the payment terms of this contract, with invoices submitted to:

Department of Energy (2 copies)  
 National Energy Technology Laboratory  
 Attn: Accounts Payable  
 3610 Collins Ferry Road  
 P.O. Box 880  
 Morgantown, WV 26507-0880

U.S. Department of Energy (1 copy)  
 Oak Ridge Financial Services Center  
 P.O. Box 4787  
 200 Administration Road  
 Oak Ridge, TN 37831  
 (can be submitted electronically through VIPERS at  
<http://finweb.oro.doe.gov/vipers.htm>)

**18. Funds Allotment**

In accordance with the Funds Allotment Clause of the contract, the total amount allotted for this Task Order is \$  
 Funds are allotted through the Ordering Contracting Officer's organization.

Allotment Symbol:      Approp. Symbol:      Obj. Class:      B&R Code:      B&R \$:

**19. Amendments/Changes**

After issuance, any necessary revisions to this Task Order to the estimated cost or level of effort shall be promptly submitted to the Ordering Contracting Officer in a revised Task Plan. Revised Task Plans submitted by the contractor are subject to review and approval by the Ordering Contracting Officer.

**20. Pricing**

☐ Fixed Price \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 OR

☒ Cost Reimbursement

Estimated/Target Cost \$  
 Fixed Fee \$ (if applicable)  
 Estimated/Target Cost \$

Incentive Fee: Target Fee \$ **TBD**  
 Minimum Fee \$ **0.00**  
 Maximum Fee \$ **TBD**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name and Signature of Contracting Officer's Rep.      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name and Signature of Contracting Officer      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name and Signature of Contractor      Date

## REQUEST FOR TASK PROPOSAL/ORDER ADDENDUM

### TASK ORDER SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

#### ***Limitation of Funds***

It is the intent of the Government to incrementally fund this Task Order and to authorize performance in phases as identified in the Statement of Work (Phase I, II, and III). Target Cost and Incentive Fee will be based on total performance in all three phases of work.

#### **LIMITATION OF FUNDS – COST PLUS INCENTIVE FEE**

Pursuant to FAR 52.232-22, "Limitation of Funds," total funds in the amount of \$ **TBD** are obligated herewith and made available for payment of allowable costs and incentive fee to be incurred from the effective date of this contract through the completion of Phase I. Additional funds will be made available for subsequent awarded phases through modification to this Task Order.

#### ***Ceiling Price of Task Order***

The ceiling price of this Task Order, inclusive of incentive fee is \$ **TBD**. The initial ceiling price of this Task Order will be established as a Not to Exceed amount to enable performance to begin on Phase I, prior to DOE's final selection of site locations. Within 10 working days after DOE's notification of site alternatives and technology alternatives to be included in this EIS, the contractor shall submit a final cost estimate for the entire project. Upon completion of negotiation, acceptance of the final cost estimate, and finalization of the Incentive Fee, the ceiling price of task order will be adjusted through a Task Order Modification.

#### ***Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest***

The Contractor must not have any conflicts of interest if the Contractor undertakes the work under this SOW. The Contractor and subcontractors must sign a "no conflict of interest" statement as prescribed in 40 CFR 1506.5(c) prior to beginning work stating that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the FutureGen Project. Such contractors and subcontractors shall not conduct FutureGen-related work, or make an agreement to conduct FutureGen-related work, directly or indirectly for either a site proponent or the FutureGen Alliance, Inc., during the period such contractors and subcontractors are performing FutureGen NEPA services for DOE.

#### ***Cost Plus Incentive Fee***

##### ***Introduction***

Due to uncertainty surrounding FutureGen's final plant design and siting locations, it has been determined that a cost reimbursable contract with incentives is the most appropriate mechanism for sharing risk between the contractor and the Government. **The Target Fee will not be established until acceptance of the Contractors final cost estimate upon selection of the site alternatives and technology alternatives that are to be included in the EIS.** The purpose of this section of the addendum is to ensure a timely, quality, and cost efficient completion of NEPA activities for the FutureGen project under a cost reimbursable contract scheme. To achieve this, incentives for schedule, quality and cost control are detailed below.

**Note: In accordance with Section H.2, Modification Authority, of the IDIQ contract, the fee calculator has been modified from the one identified in Section H.24, Incentive Fee, of the IDIQ contract. Specifically, three elements have been utilized in the fee calculation structure and a 90/10 cost share ratio is utilized for the over runs and under runs.**

##### ***Discussion***

The FutureGen Project Team has elected to use a modified version of the "Incentive Fee Calculator" provided by the DOE NEPA web-site where the three incentivized elements and their relative weights are:

Schedule:	50%
Quality:	30%
Cost Control:	20%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>

Consistent with the incentive fee calculator, the Maximum Fee for FutureGen will be an additional 10% of the target cost determined by direct negotiations upon final selection of the FutureGen sites and technology alternatives which will be included in the FutureGen EIS. The Target Fee will be 7% of the final established target cost. The Minimum Fee will be 0% of allowable target cost. The "Government/Contractor cost share ratio" for both over runs and under runs will be 90/10.

For illustrative purposes only, the modified DOE Incentive Fee Calculator to be used for FutureGen yields the following results, where:

- Target Cost is **\$3,000,000**
- Maximum Fee of 10% (**\$300,000**)
- Target Fee of 7% (**\$210,000**)
- Minimum Fee of 0% (**\$0**)
- Schedule rating is **"Good"**
- Quality rating is **"Good"**
- Actual Total Allowable Cost of **\$3,300,000** (\$300,000 over run)
- "Government/Contractors Cost Share Ratio" is **90/10**

INPUT SECTION	
Target Cost	\$3,000,000
Maximum Fee (10%)	\$300,000
Target Fee (7%)	\$210,000
Minimum Fee	\$0
Actual Final Schedule Rating	Good
Actual Final Quality Rating	Good
Actual Total Allowable Cost	\$3,300,000

#### Part 1 Fee - Schedule - 50%

Target Part 1 Fee		\$105,000	
<u>Rating</u>			<u>Part 1 Fee</u>
Unsatisfactory	0%		\$0 00
Poor	25%		\$26,250 00
Fair	50%		\$52,500 00
Good	100%		\$105 000 00
Excellent	125%		\$131,250 00
Excellent Plus	150%		\$157,500 00

#### Part 2 Fee - Quality - 30%

Target Part 2 Fee		\$63,000	
<u>Rating</u>			<u>Part 2 Fee</u>
Unsatisfactory	0%		\$0 00
Poor	25%		\$26,250 00
Fair	50%		\$31,500 00
Good	100%		\$63,000 01
Excellent	125%		\$78,750 01
Excellent Plus	150%		\$94,500 01

#### Part 3 Fee - Cost Control - 20%

Target Part 3 Fee		\$42 000	
<u>Total Allowable Cost</u>			<u>Part 3 Fee</u>
Under run/(Over run) Amount	(\$300,000)	cost share ratio is 90/10	
Variance from Target Cost	-10.00%	use target Part 3 Fee if within +/- 3%	
Adjustment from Target Fee	(\$30.000)		

Cost Under run or Over run >5%

\$12 000 00

Cost within +/- 3%

\$42,000 00

**Incentive Fee Payable**

Part 1 Fee earned	\$105,000
Part 2 Fee earned	\$63,000
Part 3 Fee earned	\$12,000
Total Part 1,2 & 3 Fee earned	\$180,000

<b>Incentive Fee Payable</b>	<b>\$180,000</b>
------------------------------	------------------

**Performance Measures and Metrics**

Due to the schedule-driven nature of the NEPA activities and to avoid delays, contract performance will be assessed and incentives paid only once, at the end of the performance period. However, at the contractor's request, the Government will provide the contractor with an informal assessment of their performance at the conclusion of each NEPA contract phase (Phases 1 and 2).

The performance measures and their associated metrics are as follows.

Schedule (Assumes no government caused delays or delays due to events outside the contractor's control)<sup>1</sup>

- *Excellent Plus (150% of applicable schedule target fee)* : 15 or more days ahead of schedule
- *Excellent (125% of applicable schedule target fee)*: 0 – 14 days ahead of schedule
- *Good (100% of applicable schedule target fee)*: 1 – 14 days behind schedule
- *Fair (75% of applicable schedule target fee)*: 15 – 28 days behind schedule
- *Poor (25% of applicable schedule target fee)*: 29 – 42 days behind schedule
- *Unsatisfactory (0% of applicable schedule target fee)*: 43 or more days behind schedule

Quality:

- *Excellent Plus (150% of applicable schedule target fee)* :
  - Document Review Team requires only one review of DEIS, and
  - Document Review Team requires only one review of FEIS, and
  - DOE requires no follow-up DOE review of approved DEIS before printing, and
  - DOE requires no follow-up DOE review of approved FEIS before printing, and
  - All other NEPA documents and products submitted to DOE require only one revision before being accepted by DOE, and
  - Meetings and conferences are attended when invitations are issued by DOE or the Alliance , and
  - All CEQ regulation requirements (both document requirements and process requirements) met, and
  - All EIS checklist items met on DEIS when reviewed by Document Review Team.
- *Excellent (125% of applicable schedule target fee)*:
  - First four of the eight above metrics are met, and
  - Three of last four of above metrics fully met, and
  - At least 90% compliance with all above metrics that were not fully met.

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of fee determination, the Government will establish the baseline schedule (by date and by number of performance weeks) and will modify it accordingly to account for delays not attributable to contractor performance. Delays not attributable to contractor performance will arise only from Government caused delay or a DOE decision to slip the scheduled date of the publication of the ROD

- *Good (100% of applicable schedule target fee):*
  - First four of the eight above metrics are met, and
  - Two of last four of the above metrics fully met, and
  - At least 80% compliance with all of the above metrics that were not fully met.
- *Fair (50% of applicable schedule target fee):*
  - Two of first four of the eight above metrics fully met, and
  - At least 80% compliance with all of the above metrics that were not fully met.
- *Poor (25% of applicable schedule target fee):*
  - One of first four of the eight above metrics fully met, and
  - At least 70% compliance with all of the above metrics that were not fully met.
- *Unsatisfactory (0% of applicable quality target fee):* Requirements for a rating of Poor not met or a Cure Notice was required to be issued by the Contracting Officer.

**Cost Control:** The Target Cost will be established upon negotiations completed after the Government identifies the site alternatives and technology alternatives for the EIS. Target Fee will be 7% of the Target Cost and Maximum Fee will be 10% of the Target Cost. For total allowable costs within a +/- 3% of target, the Target level incentive will be awarded. For cost under/over runs, the Government/contractor cost share ratio will be 90/10. For the example shown above, an over run of \$300,000 is more than 3% of the Target Cost, therefore the Government's share of the over run will be \$270,000 (90%), the contractor will forfeit an adjustment from the Target Fee an amount equal to \$30,000 (10%) of the available \$42,00 target incentive under the Cost Control performance element.

**INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS (REQUEST FOR TASK PROPOSAL ONLY)**

Each Offeror is required to include in their proposal the following items in separate files through the IIPS program:

For consistency, the Offeror is instructed to use the file names specified below. Filename extensions shall clearly indicate the software application used for preparation of the documents, i.e., ".pdf" for Adobe Acrobat, or ".doc" for Word files:

**(a) FORMAT AND CONTENT VOLUME I/OFFER OR OTHER DOCUMENTS**

When the Offeror begins to "Create Proposal" for response to this request, the Offeror will complete the required fields and attach the following files to the link identified as: Attach Volume I/Offer or Other Documents. Volume I, Offer and Other Documents, shall include the following documents (in the order listed):

	MANDATORY FILE	FILE NAME
File 1	RFTP Form and Addendum	42921 RFTP Form and Addendum.---
File 2	Exceptions and Deviations	Exceptions.---

1. File 1 - RFTP Form and Addendum

The Offeror shall include in File 1 the signed RFTP form.

2. File 2 – Exceptions and Deviations

The Offeror shall identify and explain any exceptions or deviations taken or conditional assumptions made with respect to the resulting task order, and the requirements included in Volume I -- Offer and Other Documents, Volume II - Technical Proposal, and Volume III -- Cost Proposal, if applicable. Any exceptions taken must contain sufficient justification to permit evaluation. The benefit to the Government shall be explained for each exception taken. Without discussions, any exceptions or deviations may make the proposal unacceptable for award without discussions.

**(b) FORMAT AND CONTENT VOLUME II/TECHNICAL PROPOSAL**

When the Offeror begins to "Create Proposal" for response to this request, the Offeror will complete the required fields and attach the following files to the link identified as: Attach Volume 2/ Technical Proposal.

For consistency, the Offeror is instructed to use the file names specified below. Filename extensions shall clearly indicate the software application used for preparation of the documents, i.e., ".pdf" for Adobe Acrobat, or ".doc" for Word files:

	MANDATORY FILES	FILENAME
File 1	EIS Implementation and Quality Assurance Plan	EIS Implementation - QA Plan.---
File 2	Topical outline of the EIS	Topical Outline ---
File 3	Management Approach Discussion	MANAGEMENT.---

1. File 1 - EIS Implementation and Quality Assurance Plan

The Offeror shall include as part of their proposal an EIS Implementation and Quality Assurance Plan. This plan is limited to maximum of thirty (30) pages (excluding cover page and table of contents), single spaced, using 12 point font, 1" margins, and when printed will fit on size 8 1/2" by 11" paper. The EIS Implementation Plan must specify the work that would be performed to complete the EIS and explain the procedures that assure a reasonable level of quality is maintained for the Draft EIS, Final EIS, other NEPA Documents, and supporting reports plus data. For each issue or item in the detailed topical outline (see below), there should be a description of (1) the field work to be performed, (2) the various data collection efforts and the verification of information submitted by others (i.e., Alliance, site proponents and their contractors), (3) how the data would be analyzed, (4) the computer models or methods that would be used and what information they would yield, (5) QA/QC procedures (by name or general description, such as ASTM Method #\_\_\_\_) used in each data collection effort, in each analytical or modeling effort, and in document preparation, (6) the anticipated results of each analytical effort, and (7) the format (e.g., lists, tables, charts, drawings, maps, comparative tables, descriptive text, etc.) of the materials that would be produced for the EIS. This Plan should give a clear indication of the intended nature of the EIS, in terms of its scope, detail, and usefulness.

The document must specifically address how quality of documents and supporting data would be maintained while adhering to the schedule. This Plan should fulfill the requirements for a Quality Assurance Plan. If the Contractor has an existing Quality Assurance Plan, it may be submitted separately, and other requirements may be submitted in an EIS Implementation Plan developed specifically for the FutureGen Project.

This EIS Implementation and Quality Assurance Plan could be made available to the public. Therefore, please mark paragraphs or sentences containing non-releasable proprietary information so that these paragraphs or sentences could be redacted prior to any public release of this document. Generally, the document should be written for public release and should provide DOE, the Proposal Review and Selection Team, and the public with a high degree of confidence in the proficiency, attention to detail, technical capability, and document preparation protocols of the Contractor. The document should not be a sales pitch – it should provide public assurance and a basis for technical evaluation of the Contractor's proposal by explaining the procedures to be used by the Contractor.

## 2. File 2 - Topical outline of the EIS

The Contractor shall include with their proposal a detailed topical outline of the EIS that includes all the topics that are customarily included within a U.S. DOE EIS for a project of this type, size and impact potential. This outline must include sufficient sub-topics to clearly indicate how the Contractor intends to present within the EIS the multiple sites and, if considered, alternative power plant configurations. It should also indicate coverage of the issues raised during internal scoping efforts. These issues are listed in the Advanced Notice of Intent (ANOI).

## 3. File 3 – Management Approach Discussion

The contractor shall include a detailed description of the availability of resources for conducting a multi-phase/multi-location Environmental Impact Statement project of this magnitude, including a discussion of how the contractor will obtain additional resources quickly (please note that all resources utilized must not have a conflict of interest) in the event that additional sites or additional technology alternatives are included in the EIS. Furthermore, this file should include resumes and letters of commitment for all critical staff being proposed by the contractor. This file should fulfill the requirements for a project management plan (under the DOE-Wide NEPA Contracts SOW).

## (c) FORMAT AND CONTENT VOLUME III/COST PROPOSAL

When the Offeror begins to "Create Proposal" for response to this request, the Offeror will complete the required fields and attach the following files to the link identified as: Attach Volume 3/ Cost Proposal.

For consistency, filename extensions shall clearly indicate the software application used for preparation of the documents, i.e., ".pdf" for Adobe Acrobat, or ".doc" for Word files:

General. Volume III, Cost Proposal, shall consist of the Offeror's estimated costs to perform the desired work as set forth in the Statement of Work utilizing the cost assumptions identified below. The Cost Proposal shall include a cost discussion

### 1. Cost Estimate

Because the number of site alternatives and technology alternatives is unknown at this time, cost estimates should be based on an assumption that the EIS would cover three site alternatives and one base-case technology alternative for each phase. A generic suite of technologies for research and development efforts will be assumed; therefore, the base-case technologies will address only the principal power plant train (or backbone) of the power plant. The power plant is expected to consist of a principal power plant train (or backbone), and a development aspect, which may be manifest either as a separate test bed or as substituted technologies or components in the initial power plant train.

The Contractor will include with their proposal a detailed cost estimate in addition to a summary statement of costs. The detailed cost estimate must provide the costs associated with the performance of each subtask in each Phase for the base case assumptions. A spread sheet detailing labor time and costs by function (e.g., project manager I, environmental scientist II, engineer I, regulatory specialist I) and other direct costs should be included for each primary cost component (i.e., subtask, as presented in the Statement of Work)

The proposal must also contain a "cost summary" that sums the costs for each subtask in each Phase to get the estimated base price for Phase I and for the contingent Phases II and III. The estimated base price should assume that three (3) site



proposals (each consisting of both a power plant site and one sequestration site -- six locations in total) would be addressed in the EIS along with one (1) power plant configuration (technology alternative) and that there would be up to four (4) public scoping meetings and four (4) public hearings associated with these three site proposals. Each separate site proposal is a site alternative for purposes of this NEPA review.

The "cost summary" must detail the cost for document reproduction and distribution of the EIS and Summary document that must be produced and distributed (including update of distribution lists, postage and handling). The cost proposal must list the assumptions upon which the cost estimates are based.

Table 1. Costs for Document Reproduction and Distribution

Number of copies	Draft (\$)	Final (\$)
Printed EIS	\$ ____ for first 200 copies	\$ ____ for first 200 copies
Printed Summary	\$ ____ for first 1000 copies	\$ ____ for first 1000 copies
CD (EIS & Summary)	\$ ____ for first 1000 copies	\$ ____ for first 1000 copies
Total costs		

The phrase "power plant configuration", as used here, refers to a specific layout of the power plant train (i.e., air supply unit → gasifier → syngas cleanup devices → syngas component separation devices → gas turbine + steam turbine → flue gas cleanup devices + other steam cycle devices) and a side stream (or slip stream) R&D test bed, if any. The alternatives for various functions along the main power plant train (e.g., quench gasifier vs. fluidized bed gasifier vs. transport gasifier) will be addressed in the EIS as a series of options. Each option will be presented and analyzed in generic terms, without regard to minor differences between brands (e.g., GE vs. Shell). For purposes of cost estimation, it should be anticipated that a "power plant configuration" will include one side stream or slip stream R&D test bed. For any side stream or slip stream, the expected functions undergoing R&D would be explained in generic terms, given that all the possibilities for future R&D cannot be foreseen at this point in time.

Other devices and components of the project will be presented and analyzed in generic terms without regard to minor differences between brands. Additional components of the project include material transportation routes; fuel preparation and handling equipment; ash or slag handling equipment; water processing and handling equipment; electricity generation and transmission equipment; pipelines; injection wells; sequestration reservoirs; and the balance-of-project (fans, compressors, storage tanks, maintenance shop, etc.). Where the range of potential environmental impacts may vary widely (e.g., as a function of the layout of facilities and equipment or because of differing processes used in competing equipment options), the range of potential impacts must be presented, analyzed and discussed in the EIS.

## 2. Additive Cost Estimate

A separate additive cost estimate shall be submitted for information purposes only.

This cost estimate and summary shall specify the cost for: (1) each additional power plant site (above the base case of three), (2) each additional sequestration site (a "field," which may contain multiple injection targets) (above the base case of three), (3) each additional power plant configuration (i.e., technology alternative) addressed within the EIS (above the base case of one), (4) each additional public scoping meeting or public hearing, covering the support that would be provided to plan and host each meeting (above the base case of four each), and (5) each additional 100 copies (fill in blanks in Table 2) of the EIS and Summary document that must be produced and distributed (including update of distribution lists, postage and handling), above the base cost estimate numbers. The cost proposal must list the assumptions upon which the cost estimates are based.

Table 2. Costs for Document Reproduction and Distribution

Number of copies	Draft (\$)	Final (\$)
Printed EIS	\$ ____ per 100 additional copies	\$ ____ per 100 additional copies
Printed Summary	\$ ____ per 100 additional copies	\$ ____ per 100 additional copies
CD (EIS & Summary)	\$ ____ per 100 additional copies	\$ ____ per 100 additional copies
Total costs		

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROPOSALS SUBMITTED (REQUEST FOR TASK PROPOSAL ONLY)**

### **Overall Relative Importance of Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation criteria (other than cost) when combined, are considered significantly more important than cost.

The Offer and Other Documents Proposal will be evaluated for adequacy and compliance with the solicitation. The individual elements that comprise the following criteria are not listed in order of importance and will not be individually weighted, but rather will be considered as a whole in developing an overall point score for each criterion:

### **Technical Evaluation**

#### **1. EIS Implementation, Quality Assurance Plan, Topical Outline of the EIS (40%)**

The proposal will be evaluated under this criterion based on reasonableness of choice of methodologies, approach to and demonstrated understanding of EIS scope/detail. The proposal will be evaluated on the feasibility of the EIS Implementation and Quality Assurance Plan for successful completion within the schedule presented. The proposal will be evaluated on the completeness of the Topical Outline to demonstrate a full understanding of the type, size, and impact potential of the proposed project, as well as inclusion of issues identified during the internal scoping efforts (as listed in the ANOI).

#### **2. Management Approach (40%)**

The proposal will be evaluated under this criterion based on the approach to ensuring the requirements of the Statement of Work are met, demonstrated company management commitment to the contract, approach to and understanding of how the proposed organizational structure relates to performance of the Statement of Work, approach to recruitment and retention of personnel (specifically the ability to quickly obtain resources for additional sites or technology approaches included in the EIS), and approach to subcontracting. The proposal will be evaluated under this criterion based on the caliber and fit of key personnel and critical personnel proposed to accomplish the EIS within the schedule. The key personnel's and critical personnel's education, credentials, experience, management experience and professional development encompassing skills and years of experience and training related to the requirements will be considered. In addition, the proposal will be evaluated based on the percentage of time key personnel will be dedicated to the Task Order. The proposal shall also be evaluated on the Offerors understanding of the requirement based on their assignment of positions to key and critical personnel.

#### **3. Past Performance (20%)**

The Offeror's past performance will be evaluated with respect to satisfaction of the customer cost and technical requirements, customer relations, production and product timeliness, corporate integrity and all other functions associated with the management and administration of contract(s).

Each Offeror will be evaluated on its performance under existing and prior task orders issued under the DOE-Wide NEPA contract. The Government will focus on information that demonstrates the quality of the Contractor's performance.

(Note: Offerors without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past or present performance is not available, will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably on past performance (receiving a score of 5 on a scale of 0 to 10)).

**Cost Evaluation****1. Cost Evaluation**

The cost proposal will not be point scored. The Cost Estimate will be evaluated to determine the most probable cost to the Government. The Government will determine (i.e. rate as acceptable or unacceptable) whether the Offeror's cost proposal is realistic (i.e. adequate to accomplish the RFTP's Statement of Work), accurate, and reasonable (i.e. proposed costs are generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for contract performance and do not exceed those which would be incurred by an ordinary prudent person in the conduct of competitive business based on the cost assumptions provided in the instructions to Offerors).

The cost proposal will also be used as a guide to determine the Offeror's understanding of the requirements of the RFTP and to assess the validity of the Offeror's approach to performing the work in accordance with the technical requirements of the RFTP.

**Evaluation of Additives**

The additive cost estimate will not be considered in evaluation of proposals except to determine that the estimate is fair and reasonable should any of the additives be elected for inclusion in final cost estimate (required after DOE's identification of site alternatives and technology alternatives). This will be used for informational purposes only and as a base line for comparison with the final cost estimate if additional sites and/or technologies are included